

REMARKS

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Final Office Action maintained that the feature of "crystallization is effected from a suspension" is indefinite because crystallization requires the compound to be completely dissolved, while applicants maintain that the specification describes a situation where at no point a clear solution exists. The Final Office Action also found the term "from the resultant heated solution" indefinite.


Claim 8 is amended in a way believed to overcome the noted rejection without raising new issues.

Language supporting the issue of a heated solution is found in the Examples of the application.

Applicants' maintain claim 12 is not indefinite. As shown in the Examples, crystallization can be effected from suspensions. A copy of the publication A.L. Fitzhugh, Pteridines 4 (4), 187-191 (1993) cited on page 1, line 22 of the specification has been provided herewith.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard J. Traverso (Reg. No. 30,595)
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410
Attorney Docket No. :EPROV-15

Date: September 7, 2001